SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

16th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XVI, Number 1 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 January 15, 1986

Hoping for Special Treatment

Gramm-Rudman Gloom? Not Among the R&D Chiefs

With its obligatory march to a zero deficit within 5 years, the Gramm-Rudman doomsday machine all at once topples the traditional political practice of giving most federal programs at least small annual budget increases. Huge volumes of current and planned spending are to be eliminated under the law, a goal that has heretofore eluded the fiercest efforts of the Reagan Administration.

Why, then, amid the uncertainty and gloom pervading Washington, are many of the managers of the federal science establishment peculiarly hopeful about prospects for their programs? The answer, from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), is that the Administration and the Congress have all along collaborated on generous support for science. And, though research is not among the small group of federal activities—mainly social-welfare programs and interest on the national debt—that are exempted from Gramm-Rudman cuts, there's an expectation that the generosity will continue.

With the budget for the 1987 fiscal year now in the final stages of preparation, sources at OSTP and the Office of Management and Budget tell SGR that basic-research spending, rather than nosediving, will continue to increase. "Basic research will be treated well," said one official who's been involved in the budget details.

Congress's R&D Pork-Barrel Record: A 4-Year Review—Page 7

In the eight-and-a-half months that remain of fiscal 1986, $11.7 billion of appropriated funds are slated for the ax, as the initial step toward the long-term goal of eliminating the deficit. To achieve that, it's expected that the unprotected domestic programs must be trimmed by approximately 4.3 percent and maybe as much as 5 percent, across the board. The cuts are to be ordered by the President following recommendations by the General Accounting Office, and scheduled to take effect March 1.

But so far, despite some reports to the contrary, the money managers at the major federal research agencies report that they have not been slowing spending in anticipation of lean months ahead; instead, they're dishing out their funds on pre-Gramm-Rudman schedules.

The prospect of reductions in budgets already in hand is distasteful for R&D administrators, who, after all, take pride in delivering funds to their clamoring constituents in academe, the government's own labs, and industry. But some of these administrators privately say that Congress and the Administration took good care of their 1986 appropriations requests, and that they can tolerate a 3-5 percent nick without serious disruptions.

Surveying the major research-supporting agencies, SGR collected the following views, expectations, and anxieties:

National Science Foundation: A mere 3.1 percent increase for 1986 kept NSF at a budgetary standstill, but the appropriation followed 12 percent increases in each of the preceding 2 years, and puts NSF spending at a record high of $1.555 billion. After a slow start in spending this year because of budget delays on Capitol Hill, NSF is dishing out funds at a normal pace. Sandra Toye,

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

The rumor circuit is echoing various possibilities for the post of White House Science Adviser, vacated December 31 by George A. Keyworth II: GE Senior Vice President Roland Schmitt, Chairman of the National Science Board; J. Fred Bucy, formerly of Texas Instruments; Ralph E. Gomory, IBM Vice President for Research, and Rosalyn S. Yalow, 1977 Nobel laureate in medicine.

Then, too, according to one member of the White House Science Council, there's the possibility that Don Regan and his henchmen don't regard the post as essential and may dawdle in filling it, if at all. At the helm as Acting Director, as of January 1, is John P. McTague, Deputy Director under Keyworth. NSF Director Erich Bloch's offer to help out, pending selection of a successor for Keyworth, has drawn no response from the White House.

Unlike other institutions where a staffer wins a Nobel Prize, the US Naval Research Lab—whose Jerome Karle shared it in chemistry this year—has indulged in little public celebration. The lab is indeed proud, but sources there say the Navy brass signaled restraint. NRL, under increasing pressure to hold down costs and produce for the fleet, is referred to by skeptics as Nuts Running Loose, while its administrative boss, the Office of Naval Research, is tagged the Office of No Results.

. . . Hopes High for Avoiding Severe Budget Cuts

(Continued from page 1)

NSF's Controller, told SGR that "there have been no instructions to anyone here to reduce spending." She added that "we know we may lose money when we're half way through the [current] fiscal year, but right now we're on schedule with our spending."

The Reagan White House has no cultural attachment to science; it values NSF as a supporter of research and training with industrial and military value. Congress does, too, with the added factor of affection for NSF money going to local institutions. As a result, NSF's budget has increased by $500 million since Reagan took office. NSF and its friends are confident that the budget isn't going to be whacked too hard by Gramm-Rudman, and maybe not at all.

National Institutes of Health. The Reagan Administration never gives up in its efforts, direct and sly, to cut the Bethesda-Capitol Hill axis and crimp NIH's budget growth. It has never succeeded, and that's why NIH and its beneficiaries are confident that the agency will take Gramm-Rudman in stride. But meanwhile, the OMB is after NIH again, seeking to cut a reported $300-$400 million from the $5.5 billion that a bountiful Congress provided for the current fiscal year. The proposed cut is "under discussion" with OMB.

The big appropriation mocked White House attempts to hold NIH close to the $5.1 billion it received last year, and it demonstrated that biomedical research remains one of the most politically untouchable programs.

Despite the budgetary turmoil that the Administration has inflicted on NIH in fiscal 1985 and again this year, spending is on schedule, William F. Raub, Associate Director for Extramural Research and Training, told SGR. Raub also pointed out that NIH's grant portfolio has risen from a total of about 15,000 to 18,000 in recent years, as Congress has resisted Administration efforts to hold new and competing awards within an annual ceiling of 5,000. (The 1986 appropriations bill specifies a total of 6100 new and competing awards.)

The bill says that NIH should trim direct and indirect cost payments to keep up the number of awards. But Bethesda's grant managers can only go so far in that process before the howls of hurting deans and grantees reach Capitol Hill. The special dynamics of biomedical politics dictate that more support from Congress nurtures pressure for still more support.

Defense Department, Basic Research Support. Something phenomenal and not widely noted happened in research funding last year. Academic lobbyists nudged and pestered the Defense Department to provide more support for basic research in universities. The response was a modestly formulated program, the University Research Initiative, set to start out at $25 million this year, and rise in a few years to $100 million. The House voted for the sum that was sought, but the Senate appropriated $100 million as the startup figure, and the House agreed. The money will be awarded, in equal shares, by the three armed services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Meanwhile, apart from the new university program, the Pentagon's existing basic research fund—category 6.1 on DoD's R&D budget chart—was given a healthy boost, from $861 million in fiscal 1985 to $961 million for this year. About half of that money supports research in universities; the balance is assigned to government and industrial laboratories.

The Pentagon's research administrators are glowing over their good fortune, but they're also apprehensive about the coming Gramm-Rudman crunch, from which the Pentagon is not exempt, regardless of the President's insistence on a real 3 percent increase in Defense spending. There's particular angst over what's referred to as the "finger pointing process," whereby proposals for new research ventures must be accompanied by sacrificial recommendations to pay the costs. Under that system, said one of the Pentagon's science administrators, "it's easy to point at 6.1 spending, since you won't feel it for 10 years."

Agriculture. "We're encouraged for 1986; we got a good budget," says Orville Bentley, the Department of Agriculture's Assistant Secretary for Science and Education. It wasn't a booming budget, but, given that 1986 was supposed to be the year of the cut and the freeze, it wasn't bad. The Agricultural Research Service went from $481 to $503 million; the Cooperative State Research Service from $266 million to $290 million, while the Extension Service held steady at about $300 million.

Referring to the Gramm-Rudman reductions that will

(Continued on page 3)

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1986

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, $185.00 (two years, $325.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

NIH: Congress Mandates Host of New Activities

The National Institutes of Health is working to fulfill a flock of new responsibilities that were assigned to it by the last Congress, despite NIH's resistance and a Presidential veto.

The biggest items in the latest NIH Authorization Act are two long-lobbied-for goals, the Institute for Arthritis, Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases and the Center for Nursing Research.

The Arthritis Institute, which has been extracted from the existing National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, is well along in getting organized since President Reagan directed its creation by administrative order late last year in a last-minute effort to forestall Congressional action. Lawrence E. Shulman, who was Associate Director for Arthritis, Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases in the original institute, will serve as Acting Director of the new creation while a search committee reviews candidates.

The Center for Nursing Research represents a compromise between NIH's preference for nothing at all in that department and the nursing lobby's campaign for a full-fledged Institute of Nursing. It has been referred to as "an institute in sheep's clothing," but all indications are that on the scale of NIH spending and manpower, it will not be a large undertaking, for a long time, if ever. At present, there's $5 million for the Center, leftover from money that was appropriated two years ago in the expectation that the Center would then win authorization. An Acting Director is to be selected shortly, but a full-fledged appointment is not expected until perhaps next fall.

The Authorization Act, mainly the work of Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), Chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommitee of the Energy and Environment Committee, also calls for biennial reports to Congress from all of NIH's various major components. Reports are now made by the Heart, Cancer, and Arthritis institutes. Waxman, who strongly supports NIH but would like to get more control over its operations, has taken the mandated report route as a means for getting a firmer hold on the place, but it takes more than a report requirement to pin down the foxes of Bethesda.

With some success, Waxman and his Senate counterpart, Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), have been prodding NIH to put more emphasis on disease prevention—a subject that is privately viewed with considerable scorn in major portions of the NIH culture, which holds that well-being is to be achived by understanding molecules rather than by consuming granola and spinach.

Obviously aware of this, the authors of the Authorization Act decreed that the Director of NIH, the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute for Child Health and Development must each add

(Continued on page 4)

. . . Reagan Spares Space Station from Near-Wipeout by OMB

(Continued from page 2)

be decreed in March by the President, Bentley said, "We start from a good base," and, on the forbidden subject of the forthcoming 1987 presidential budget, he said that "discussions are on the positive side."

Department of Energy. Lacking instructions to do otherwise, DOE's civilian science managers are spending as before, but they're thinking hard about how to allocate what they anticipate will be a 4.3 percent cut in March. As for the 1987 budget, the word there is that fusion research will decline still further while most other science programs "seem to be coming through reasonably well."

The biggest item on DOE's long-term agenda, the Superconducting Super Collider, "is still on track," SGR was advised, "but after 3 years of studies on costs, schedules, etc., it's getting close to the time to make up our minds about whether we're going to do it or not."

NASA. The space agency's great new aerospace welfare project, the permanently manned space station, came close to a wipeout at OMB, which cut NASA's 1987 request for the project from $580 million to about $100 million and recommended a 3-year delay in the startup. NASA is reported to have appealed to the President, and now it seems likely that the space station will be funded at around $270 million next year, and delayed for only 12-18 months.

In terms of research politics, the episode is instructive. Reagan is a devotee of R&D as a source of national strength and international prestige. The NASA lobbyists appealed to him on those grounds, and thus kept the project moving along, despite the President's insistence that deficit-reduction most take precedence over everything but defense.

In sum, then, the science bureaucracy seems to be standing a bit aloof from the fright that Gramm-Rudman has caused in official Washington. It's concerned by the budgetary uncertainty that lies ahead and by the robotic nature of the cutting process if deficit-reductions goals aren't met. Science's attitude may simply reflect a foolish complacency that's in for a hard landing. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that many well-situated people are convinced that the Administration and Congress will take special care of science.—DSG

White House Biotech Committee Now in Operation

The New Year brings into full-fledged operation a new White House-based group, the Biotechnology Science Coordination Committee (BSCC). Just what it is and is supposed to do isn't easily apparent. But, for starters, it should be noted that industry is happy about the setup, a response that suggests an absence of fear of onerous regulation, while the environmental alarmist camp regards the Committee as a sellout and a menace.

Chartered for a 2-year trial, the BSCC is attached to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) as part of the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Technology, and Engineering, which is chaired by the head of OSTP. The architects of the new Committee say it was conceived as a "forum" where representatives from federal agencies concerned with biotechnology can share scientific information and improve interagency cooperation.

They say that the BSCC will help the agencies toward consistency in their approach to regulation. But the Committee has no authority to review, let alone override, the regulatory decisions of the 5 member agencies: the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Agriculture, the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, and the National Science Foundation.

Harvey Price, head of the Industrial Biotechnology Association, praised the BSCC as "an important first step" toward a "balanced" regulatory approach. Meanwhile, Jeremy Rifkin, the indefatigable tormentor of the industry, denounced it as "the White House's excuse for failing to regulate biotechnology."

Rifkin, who has derailed, if only temporarily, a number of planned biotech activities through court challenges, argues that a deep understanding of potential environmental consequences, and high assurances of safety, must precede experimentation in biotechnology and marketing of genetically engineered products. He readily acknowledges that he's out to bring the biotechnology enterprise to a halt.

With its standard anti-regulatory fervor, the Administration insists that existing safeguards and case-by-case risk-assessment techniques within the individual federal

(Continued on page 5)

. . . NIH Required to Put New Emphasis on Prevention

(Continued from page 3)

Associate Directors for Prevention to their staffs. (The Heart Institute already has one.) And it urges all other institutes to do the same.

The conference report says that the top Associate Director for Prevention—the one who's to serve in the office of the Director of NIH—"should be a forceful, competent representative for research regarding the prevention of disease. In appointing the Associate Director," it continues, "the Director of NIH should seek an individual from among the nation's outstanding public health and prevention researchers."

The Waxman-Hatch conference report also tells NIH where not to look for candidates for these jobs and what they are to do after they're appointed:

> Individuals appointed to these positions should be selected from among the nation's outstanding health promotion and public health professionals. They should not be appointed from those current NIH officials who have little or no background in the prevention field. Each Associate Director should devote full time to prevention-related activities and not have significant responsibilities for other non-prevention activities.
>
> Among the principal responsibilities of the Associate Directors should be assuring that research regarding the prevention of disease is a high priority of their respective institutes. Prevention research refers to research that is directly related to reducing the incidence of disease or disorders within the authority of the respective national research institutes, reducing the high-risk precursors of such diseases or disorders, and reducing the adverse consequences of such precursors . . .

The specifications continue into great detail, calling for the Associate Directors for Prevention to make sure that each institute's research plan provides for "investigations into the epidemiology of disease; studies of the etiology of diseases (including the effect of diet and other personal habits on the development of disease, and the effects of environmental factors, including air, water, radiation, and toxic substances, on the development of disease . . . . "

NIH is also required to prepare a research plan for developing alternatives to use of experimental animals. And, of much interest among the disease lobbies and in NIH on-campus politics, it must make a study of what's to happen to diabetes, digestive, and kidney diseases, now that they're no longer bundled into one institute with arthritis. Studies and report, within 18 months, are also mandated on lupus, spinal cord injury, and learning disability.

In addition, NIH is to require its grantee instutions to set up systems for investigating and reporting fraud.

Given this inventory of Congressional decrees, it's understandable that NIH has long preferred to exist under an old Congressional charter that more or less left the management of biomedical research and related matters to the discretion of the agency's professional managers.—DSG

. . . Member Agencies Will Conduct Own Reviews

(Continued from page 4)

agencies provide ample protection. The main room for improvement is in coordination and cooperation among the agencies, says Robert Rabin, OSTP's Assistant Director for Life Sciences. The BSCC is a sound step in that direction, he says.

Each of the BSCC's member agencies, Rabin said, will continue to handle applications for experiments and products much as they always have, by relying on their own regulatory mechanisms, which often involve academic consultants.

The division of responsibilities works out so that FDA will handle biotechnologically created pharmaceuticals, food additives and cosmetics; the NIH Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee (RAC)—senior among review bodies in the biotech field—will continue to review biomedical proposals; EPA will monitor genetically engineered pesticides; the USDA will cover genetically engineered plants, while NSF will handle the biotechnology activities of its grantees.

The BSCC has met only once since it was chartered on October 30, but though not formally tied to any set schedule, it plans to meet about once a month for the next few months. Rabin said there will be an open meeting at the National Academy of Sciences in February or March, at which the BSCC's role will be discussed and questions taken from the press and public. In the spring, the Committee will join NSF and the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment in scientific workshops at the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, NY.

The BSCC is a pale version of a plan that the Administration put forth in 1984 to create a Biotechnology Science Board within the Department of Health and Human Services. As originally conceived, it would have played a comprehensive oversight role, rather than function merely as a clearinghouse. The proposal stirred up a lot of opposition from industry executives, OSTP, and agency heads They found common ground in the view that regulation should be minimized for the fledgling industry, which faces mounting foreign competition and is still a long way from profitable operations.

During several public hearings in November and December, the BSCC's charter members and supporters extolled the new setup, while critics said that the new Committee was even more gutless than the design it replaced. But Senator David F. Durenberger (R-Minn.) likes the BSCC concept and has introduced legislation to give the Committee a statutory basis.

"Since the BSCC will not conduct a second-level review of applications, it will not delay agency decision-making," Rabin told Senator Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) at a discussion organized by the Environment and Energy Study Conference, a caucus of Congressional members. Rabin also said the exclusivity of the BSCC membership assured protection for confidential business data.

The Biotechnology Roster

The Biotechnology Science Coordinating Committee is chaired by David T. Kingsbury, NSF Assistant Director for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences. Kingsbury worked closely with the White House Science Office in writing the Committee's charter. The other members:

•

James B. Wyngaarden, Director of NIH

Orville Bentley, USDA Assistant Secretary for Science and Education

Raymond D. Lett, USDA Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services

Frank C. Young, FDA Commissioner

John Moore, EPA Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances

David Ehreth, EPA Acting Assistant Administrator for R&D

On the other side, Jack Doyle, head of the Agricultural Resources Project at the Environmental Policy Institute—a lobbying and research group—said the BSCC is too exclusive to be entrusted with any responsibility for biotechnology. Other government agencies, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, should be involved, along with scientists from outside the government, Doyle argued. OSTP's attempts to "coordinate" regulation, he said, are aimed at heading off Congressional moves in this area.

Rabin scoffed at suggestions that the BSCC will provide nothing more than a forum for bull sessions. OSTP recognizes a responsibility to facilitate development of the biotechnology industry while paying careful attention to safety issues, he said, adding: "We're dealing with reality and the law . . . and if we don't act decisively and soon, we will lose our credibility."—Judith Mathewson

(The author is a Washington-based science writer.)

Industry Slows R&D Growth

A real annual growth rate of 5.9 percent in company-funded R&D over 1985-86 is forecast by the National Science Foundation on the basis of a survey of major industrial firms.

In current dollars, the projected growth rate for this year works out to 9 percent, compared to 12 percent last year. Industry's R&D expenditures for 1986 are expected to total about $58 billion.

NSF said that "more than in previous years, company officials expressed great uncertainty about expected business conditions for the following year and were hesitant to forecast a final 1986 R&D growth figure based on their current preliminary budget plans."

R&D Pork Barrel: It's an Old Habit in Congress

Congressional pork-barreling for construction and research funds for local universities is often accomplished with such stealth that the extent of these operations tends to be underrated. But that it's a big and growing business is evident from a 4-year review of such appropriations actions, titled "Tally of Congressional Attempts to Provide Special Appropriations to Universities as of December 20, 1985."

The list, covering most but not all of these legislative episodes, was prepared by the Association of American Universities, the Washington-based lobby for big research universities. The AAU has been in the vanguard of opposition to crafty newcomers hauling off funds that in the past predominantly went to its members.

It should be noted that the construction funds were appropriated during a period in which White House policy was generally against putting up new lab buildings in academe. The lobbyists accordingly applaud their success as a gain of funds that would otherwise have been unattainable. The "haves" respond that academic R&D is essentially a zero-sum situation, and that what's gained by lobbying for the home school is mainly subtracted from so-called merit-reviewed awards. In any case, here's the AAU list, showing the calendar year in which the appropriation was voted, institution, amount of money, purpose, and the federal agency providing the funds.

•

1982

U. of Oklahoma, $3 million, Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center, Dept. of Education

1983

Oregon Health Sciences University, $20.4 million, biomedical information communications center, Dept. of Health and Human Services (HHS)

Tufts U., $2 million, hazardous waste management center, Environmental Protection Agency

U. of New Hampshire, $15 million, space and marines sciences building, Dept. of Ed.

Boston College, $7.5 million, library building, Dept. of Ed.

Georgetown U., $820,000, feasibility study for fuel-cell demonstration project, with construction costs estimated at $160 million, Dept. of Defense

Tuskegee Inst., $9 million, center for aerospace engineering and health education, Dept. of Ed.

U. of Hartford, $6.5 million, library building, Dept. of Ed.

U. of Georgia, $3.5 million, Institute of Government, Dept. of Ed.

U. of Mass., $3 million, McCormack Institute, Dept. of Ed

U. of Conn., $750,000, pediatric research and training center, HHS

U. of Hawaii, $750,000, rehabilitation research and training center, HHS

Columbia U., $5 million, plus $3 million in 1984, $8 million in 1985, center for chemical research, Dept. of Energy

1984

Boston U., $19 million, high-technology sciences and engineering center, Dept. of Commerce, Economic Development Administration (EDA)

Lincoln U. and Cheyney U., $3.4 million, construction and renovation of shared facility, Dept. of Ed.

Florida State U., $7 million, plus $8.5 million in 1985, super computer facility; estimated total cost $63 million, with federal govt. to fund 70 percent, Dept. of Energy

Catholic U., $5 million, plus $8.9 million in 1985, materials laboratory, Dept. of Energy

Northwestern U., $16 million, plus $10.3 million in 1985, basic research industry institute, Dept. of Energy

Oregon Health Sciences U., $1 million, vision research facilities, HHS

U. of N. Carolina, $800,000, expansion of undersea research program, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

U. of Oregon, $2.3 million, plus $8.5 million in 1985, planning and construction funds for science facility, Dept. of Energy

(Continued on page 7)

W. Va. Gets its Cancer Center

The intensity of Congressional determination to deliver building funds to the home campuses is illustrated by the case of the Mary Babb Randolph Cancer Center at the University of West Virginia, Morgantown. First-year construction funds totaling $4.5 million have been been made available for the Center, despite the proper workings of a peer-review system that twice turned down the project on grounds of inadequate leadership, staffing, and planning.

A pet project of Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.), the Center was earmarked for funding in the 1985 appropriations bill for the National Cancer Institute. But it failed to gain the approval of the National Cancer Advisory Board, which, by law, has veto power over such NCI grants. The Board later took another look at the project and again turned it down. The money remained in the NCI budget, unspent.

But the West Virginia project, still unapproved by the Board, will go ahead. The 1986 appropriations bill for the Department of Health and Human Services specifies that the $4.5 million should be transferred to HHS' General Departmental Management fund and awarded for the cancer center.

As a concession to the peer-review process, the Senate Appropriations Committee report states, "The Committee understands that all federal research moneys that this Center may obtain will be received through the peer review process as directed by the National Cancer Act."

The Annals of Risk-Free Heroics: The Cornell Case

Frank Rhodes, President of Cornell University, is being celebrated as a self-sacrificing hero by the battered and dwindling opponents of Congressional intervention in the award of money for academic research. But close examination suggests that his performance was unaccompanied by any peril to the advantage of his university.

The continuing resolution that a holiday-bound Congress hurriedly passed on December 19 contained numerous Pentagon-financed goodies for academe, including $10 million for computer projects at Cornell.

Upon hearing of this, Rhodes, who has spoken out against such Congressional earmarking, issued a statement in the best obufuscatory tradition of Foggy Bottom communiques:

> . . . Cornell respects the responsibility of Congress to set priorities in broad policy areas such as access to supercomputers and restoring US leadership in supercomputer technology. The University attaches equal importance to the merit review process used by funding agencies to select specific projects for support.
>
> Cornell will not accept funding awards which bypass normal review procedures. We are told that [the amendment containing the funds] was intended to help restore US leadership in supercomputer technology, a purpose we fully support, and was not intended to circumvent such merit review. The University did not develop or support any initiative intended to bypass merit review.

Rhodes' statement drew a lot of praise, typical of which was the plaudit of Robert Rosenzweig, President of the Assocation of American Universities, who told *Science* that "It was an extraordinarily difficult and principled act."

However, the reality of the situation is that, to the extent that the Pentagon employs "merit review" on such matters, Cornell starts out very far ahead. The funds are for continuing the work that's been underway for about 5 years between Cornell and Floating Point Systems, a computer manufacturer in Oregon, whose senior Senator, Mark Hatfield, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, introduced the amendment that contained the money for Cornell.

The chance of Cornell not getting the money is close to non-existent.

Appropriations *(Continued from page 6)*

1985

Indiana U., $6 million, education center, Dept. of Ed.

Dartmouth College, $15 million, construction, renovation of engineering school facilities, Dept. of Commerce, EDA

Drake U. School of Law, $4 million, facilities, etc., for clinical legal services program, Dept. of Justice

Oregon Health Sciences U., $10 million, building rehabilitation, HHS

Tufts U., $500,000, Chinese-American student exchange program, HHS

U. of Kansas, $200,000, remote-sensing research, Dept. of Agriculture, Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS)

U. of Kansas, $9 million, human development center, Dept. of Ed.

U. of N. Dakota, $4 million, energy research center, Dept. of Energy

U. of N. Dakota, $4 million, aviation sciences curriculum, Federal Aviation Administration

Florida Memorial College, $3 million, aviation sciences, FAA

Delta State U., $2.3 million, FAA

Loyola U. Law School, $4 million, poverty law center, Dept. of Justice

Mississippi State U., $6 million, center for aquaculture research, Dept. of Agriculture, CSRS

Tulane U., $6 million, energy and biomedical technology center, Dept. of Energy

Brown U., $5 million, information technology demonstration center, Dept. of Energy

Atlanta U., $4.5 million, science and technology center, Dept. of Energy

U. of Alabama, $8 million, energy and mineral research center, Dept. of Energy

Syracuse U., $12 million, computer research, DoD continuing resolution for FY 1986, which also included funds for the following:

Oklahoma State U., $1 million, unspecified research

U. of Nevada, Las Vegas, $3.5 million, computer research center

Northeastern U., $13.5 million, engineering research center

Rochester Inst. of Technology, $11 million, microelectronics engineering and imaging sciences

Wichita State U., $5 million, aviation research

U. of Kansas, $2 million, neurotoxin research

Iowa State U., $6.5 million, unspecified research

Oregon Graduate Center, $1 million, advanced semiconductor research

Cornell U., $10 million, computer basic research

Syracuse U., $12 million, computer research

"Scientist" Partners Split

The latest word about *The Scientist*, the national science newspaper originally planned as a joint venture by the Philadelphia-based Institute for Scientific Information and the British weekly *Economist:* The *Economist* has pulled out, but ISI President Eugene Garfield tells SGR that he's going ahead with the venture.

Meanwhile, Garfield and his firm face a civil trial in Federal District Court in Philadelphia on January 21 in a suit brought by a California company alleging piracy of computer software; and criminal charges are under investigation by a federal grand jury (SGR Vol. XV, No. 19.)

Garfield says he still plans to headquarter the paper in Washington, DC, and expects the first issue to be out "in late spring."

In Print: From the Presses of OTA, OECD, Etc.

By the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), available from the Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402; tel. 202/783-3238:

Demographic Trends and the Scientific and Engineering Work Force, a "technical memorandum" prepared for the House Science and Technology Task Force on Science Policy; looks skeptically at the increasingly expressed concern that a declining college-age population portends a shortage of scientists and engineers, noting that "Long-term projections of supply and demand for scientists and engineers in the economy as a whole are inherently unreliable." The memorandum—which means a quickie study rather than one of OTA's multi-year marathons—acknowledges that steadiness has prevailed in the proportion of students pursuing science and engineering degrees, but concludes that "A slight increase in the rate of selection of science and engineering careers among college-age students could more than compensate for the decline in the 18 to 24 year olds projected for the 1982-95 time frame." Where might an increase come from? OTA points out that women, Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians are unrepresented in the technical workforce; also that labor markets respond to supply and demand.

(145 pages, $6, GPO Stock No. 052-003-01014-3.)

Reproductive Health Hazards in the Work Place, prepared at the request of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and the House Agriculture Committee and Science and Technology Committee; a major OTA report, states that "Of the thousands of chemicals in the workplace, relatively few have been examined for their effects on reproductive function." Reviewing a variety of possible hazards to both women and men, the report stresses the inadequacy of the scientific base and limited efforts now underway to enlarge it. In OTA style, the report lists a variety of options, ranging from doing nothing to undertaking major research efforts accompanied by counseling and screening of workers.

(422 pages, $15, GPO Stock No. 052-003-01001-1.)

•

From the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (US Sales Office: OECD, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 1207, Washington, DC 20006; tel. 202/724-1857):

The Space Industry, Trade-Related Issues, 92 pages, jointly produced by OECD's Industry Committee and Committee on Scientific and Technological Policy, details the growing space expenditures and ambitions of a flock of nations as background to the fact that the US now faces increasing competition in commercial space activities that it once dominated.

•

From the US Department of Health and Human Services, National Health Information Clearinghouse, PO Box 1133, Washington, DC 20013-1133; tel. 800/336-4797; in Virginia, 703/522-2590:

Prevention '84/'85, 166 pages, third in a series, which started in 1981, detailing federal activities in disease and accident prevention; contains many tables and charts on incidence, costs, federal expenditures, etc.

•

From the National Institutes of Health, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, Building One, Bethesda, Md. 20205:

The NIH Role in Fostering the Nation's Leadership in Biotechnology, Proceedings of June 1985 Meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Director of NIH, summary account of the big pow-wow that NIH Director James Wyngaarden held in response to urgings from the White House Science Office for NIH to promote the biotechnology industry. The get-together was notable for a cool response to this notion from industry itself, and was the setting for the memorable utterance by Upjohn Co. Vice Chairman Theodore Cooper, former Director of the NIH Heart, Lung and Blood Institute: "Let NIH be NIH."

(The proceedings, 53 pages, are marked "for administrative use," a misty designation that means anything a federal agency chooses to make of it. But NIH has several cartons of spares of this document, and, while not inviting requests for copies, has been known to respond to them.)

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

XEROX-UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106